BIGGER Correlative Sciences Workshop

Goals of the Workshop

Gabriel N. Hortobagyi, M.D., F.A.C.P.
Professor of Medicine

Director, Breast Cancer Research Program
The University of Texas
M. D. Anderson Cancer Center
Bethesda, February 22-23, 2009

Why do we need biomarkers?

- To determine prognosis
- · To identify distinct disease subgroups
- · To predict benefit from or resistance to treatment
- · To improve classifications
- To compare trial results
- · To identify novel targets
- To improve diagnosis
- To enrich patient populations for a desirable characteristic

Historical Evolution of Biomarkers for Breast Cancer

Single Molecular

Composite expert

•uPA/PAI-1

Markers Estrogen receptor Histopathology Progesterone receptor (?) •HER-2 •Ki-67 Lymph node involvement •Grade Prognostic Indices Tumor type Nottingham Lymphovascular Prognostic Index Adiuvant!

Gene Expression Microarrays: •MammaPrint

•MammaPrint
•VDX2 array
•Oncotype DX
•97-gene genomic grade
index
•Intrinsic subtypes

Predictive Indices:

•HOXB13:IL17RB
•200-gene ER reporter index
•97-gene genomic grade

 Multigene predictors of docetaxel, paclitaxel,
 AC, EC, paclitaxel-FAC

Inefficient and Ineffective Development of Biomarkers

- Over the past four decades, more than 300 biomarkers have been proposed and supported by at least one peer-reviewed publication
- We only use Histopathology, ER, HER2, Adjuvant! and Oncotype DX in routine practice: 5 o >300!!!

Obstacles for Effective Biomarker Development

- Assessment of biomarkers is usually (always?) an afterthought in therapeutic clinical trials
- · Initial reports are irreproducible
- No validated assay
- Assay requires hard-to-get biological sample (fresh, large quantity, etc.)
- Biological hypothesis uncertain or questionable
- Absence of "deep pockets" to assess and validate proposed biomarker
- · Competing research priorities
- Necessary biospecimens unavailable
- · Relevant technology unavailable

High Bar for Predictive Tests

- Must enrich patient population with candidates likely to respond/benefit
 - What level of enrichment is clinically useful?
- Must not exclude patients likely to benefit
 - What is the acceptable level of false negative assays? 10%? 5%? 1%?
 - Can we perform clinical trials to rule out such low probabilities of false negative results?

This Symposium Should Start to Overcome those Obstacles

- All participants have a major interest in biomarker development
- It is widely accepted that the development of molecular diagnostics must accompany the development of molecular therapeutics.
- There is clear commitment from investigators, NCI and industry to improve the process of discovery and validation of biomarkers
- Our understanding of cancer biology is markedly enhanced
- NA Cooperative groups have a large collection of annotated, prospectively collected biological samples
- · High throughput technologies widely available
- Multiple candidate prognostic or predictive markers/indices available for validation
- There are funds earmarked for biomarker discovery and validation

Objectives

- 1. To develop consistent strategies and planning for evaluation of clinical utility of tumor markers by breast cancer cooperative groups.
 - 2. To specifically address two separate markers as examples:
 - a. Intrinsic subtype (basal, luminal A, B, etc) signatures as prognostic factors
 - b. Chemotherapy predictive signatures
- 3. To review currently available technologies for high throughput assays for DNA, RNA, and/or protein abnormalities designed to identify new signatures for prognosis or prediction

Should we profile all biospecimens from the cooperative groups clinical trials?

Or should we wait until technology is perfected/improved?

"Perfect" is the Worst Enemy of "Good"

What the Cooperative Groups Can (Should?) Do Going Forward

- Improve and standardize pre-analytic handling of biospecimens:
 - Time from devascularization to preservative
 - Type and time in preservative
- Explicit focus on the development of high quality biomarkers
- Strategic choices of clinically relevant questions
- Strategic choices of discovery and validation samples
- Prioritizing questions, resources and biostatistical support
- Start exploring other emerging technologies: proteomics, metabolomics, etc.

BIGGER Correlative Sciences Workshop Discussion of Specific New Trials/Studies of 2 new assays

Gabriel N. Hortobagyi, M.D., F.A.C.P.
Professor of Medicine
Director, Breast Cancer Research Program
The University of Texas
M. D. Anderson Cancer Center
Bethesda, February 23, 2009

New Prognostic and Predictive Assays

- Overview of Goals for each assay highlighting issues brought forward from previous day's discussions:
 - Definition
 - Potential Utilities
 - Assays
 - Reproducibility, CV
 - Sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV
 - Specific Studies